It is a good feeling, particularly so, when you know you have put yourself in the hands of others.

As most of us know Beaufort Memorial Hospital has been denied federal funds by the bureaucratic hierarchy of HEW because they say there is not complete and total integration of the patients in the hospital. Having seen the situation first hand, we say this is a lot of bunk and hogwash. We have never been in any place that is more integrated than here in Beaufort Memorial Hospital.

The registered nurses on duty are both white and Negro. The practical nurses are both white and Negro. Negro patients have rooms next to white patients. The nursery has Negro and white babies in basinettes side by side. Negro patients receive the same professional care that white patients receive and from our point of view nothing more could be done to help either white or Negro than is being done.

To the best of our knowledge, the only mandate of HEW's that has not been adherred to by the hospital leaders is the dictate that the hospital must routinely assign Negro patients to rooms with white patients (forcible assignment of Negroes and whites to beds side by side). The fact that the hospital officials will assign Negro and white patients to the same room by mutual consent from the patients involved is not enough for HEW. Do it whether the sick patients want it or not or you don't get the money is HEW's answer.

If we still have a democracy, and the above is the only reason the hospital has not been approved by HEW, then something is bad wrong.

You can push people just so far and if we read between the lines correctly, the hospital leaders will stand pat and take no more pushing from HEW.

If the leaders of the group or groups who say they are going to sue the hospital would direct their energies and influences on their friends in Washington, we feel sure just one word in the affirmative and approval by HEW would be forthcoming almost overnight.

They know that with approval from HEW that the hospital would get monies for added improvements, more rooms, additional equipment. They know approval is needed for the hospital to participate in Medicare. They know that for Beaufort to continue to attract young, capable, dedicated doctors we must keep pace and keep the hospital on the upward swing.

They also know that the hospital leaders have bent over backwards to comply with HEW's demands and have complied with the spirit and the full intent of the law.

Yes, we have a good hospital in Beaufort and with the right word from the right group, we can have an even better one without a long legal wait that will help no one.

Ramparts of Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1967

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the following news article from the February 24, 1967, Washington Star is of interest to anyone interested in the CIA disclosures:

CARL T. ROWAN

A few days ago a brief, cryptic report out of Prague, Czechoslovakia, was passed among a handful of top officials in Washington.

It said that an editor of Ramparts magazine had come to Prague and held "a long, secret session" with officers of the Communist-controlled International Union of Students.

Ramparts is the magazine that exposed the fact that the CIA has been financing the National Students Association, which in turn has worked for several years to prevent the IUS from dominating the youth of the world.

I learned that the Prague visitor was supposed to be Robert Scheer, Ramparts' managing editor. I telephoned him . . . and asked if he had met with IUS officers in Prague a couple of weeks ago.

"Yes," he said. "How did you know?"

He went on to volunteer that he had spent two days meeting with representatives of the National Liberation Front . . . and with IUS leaders.

Scheer hedged for a while when asked who controls the IUS, but finally said, "It is essentially an organ of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union."

Everybody is being asked to "come clean" these days and tell where he gets his money. Before the suspicion fades, Ramparts may find it desirable to reveal in detail who has provided the estimated million and a half dollars the magazine will have lost by the end of this year. And Scheer may have more to say about his mission to Prague.

That Fat Volume of Obsolete Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the administration of justice in the District of Columbia is seriously hampered by its antiquated criminal code. Mr. Leonard Downie of the Washington Post has written a most interesting and detailed article pointing out the serious and not so serious provisions of the 1901 code which contribute to the ineffectiveness of law enforcement in the District. I include Mr. Downie's article in the RECORD as a further demonstration of the need for the code's immediate revision, as provided for in my bill, H.R. 5454:

THAT FAT VOLUME OF OBSOLETE LAWS
(By Leonard Downie)

If you are thinking of flying a kite, "fire balloon or parachute" within Washington's city limits, think again. It's against the law. Under an 1892 statute still on the books, you could be fined up to $10.

You could be fined $5, under another 75-year-old law, if you go out onto any Washington "street, avenue or alley" and play football or "bandy, shindy or any other game by which a ball, stone or other substance is struck or propelled by any stick, cane or any other substance." (Baseball was not yet the National Pastime in 1892). You also risk a $5 fine if you "drive or lead any horse, mule or animal" (does this include dogs?) "or any cart or wagon . . . on any paved or graveled footways" (presumably sidewalks).

It is perfectly legal to set a bonfire during the daytime in Washington. But burning one "between the setting and the rising of the sun" could draw a $10 fine. And if you get caught burning down your neighbor's outhouse, you face one to ten years in jail.

You also could land in prison for ten years by challenging someone to a duel in the District of Columbia or by making plans in the District to fight the duel somewhere in the suburbs. If your challenged adversary turns you down, you would be liable to another three years behind bars if you assault him, call him a coward or "use other opprobrious language . . . tending to degrade or disgrace" him for refusing your gauntlet.

Washington's criminal laws have not been overhauled since they were first codified in 1901. And it is not surprising that President Johnson's D.C. Crime Commission urged Congress to create a special commission of legal experts to review and rewrite them as soon as possible. Representative Charles McC. Mathias, a Maryland Republican, already has introduced legislation authorizing the President to appoint a nine-man commission. It would have two years and $300,000 to do the job.

The Crime Commission found a wealth of laughable anachronisms in the dog-eared D.C. Code. It also found some criminal sections so outdated, incomplete and confusing that they seriously hampered law enforcement.

It is not easy for policemen or prosecutors to match the crime committed with the crime as described in the D.C. Code. There are no less than three dozen often-overlapping sections covering nonviolent theft: 11 for embezzlement, six for larceny, three for receiving stolen property, others for forgery, stealing a will, using slugs in vending machines and taking things under a variety of other false pretenses.

Yet there is only one robbery section, which provides the same penalty (six months to 15 years) for picking a pocket, or sticking up a bank with guns blazing. The inclusion of "stealthy seizure" under robbery blurs the usual distinction between larceny and robbery (robbery usually being theft by means of threats, force or violence).

Picking a pocket can be either larceny or robbery. The difference between larceny or embezzlement can turn on what the Crime Commission calls "the nebulous distinction between 'custody' and 'possession.'" Often, the prosecutor can charge a defendant with either of two crimes for the same single act.

"If the jury convicts on one," the Commission pointed out, "the defendant may appeal on the ground that the facts prove the other offense, and the appeal may be successful."

The Crime Commission found the D.C. Code's penalty structure irrational. If you get caught trying to break into a house or store, you face a maximum of a year in jail. But if you succeed in getting in, the punishment is multiplied 15 times. A lawbreaker's expertise counts for more than his intent.

The law provides a punishment (up to 15 years in jail) for manslaughter, but fails to define it. It took several court decisions to do that. Appellate panels have been forced to spell out the legal defenses absent in the Code—self-defense for murder, the *Durham Rule* for defendants suffering from mental illness.

The courts also have been asked to change disorderly conduct, vagrancy, intoxication, narcotic and other laws that appear to limit constitutional freedom or block social progress.

Congressmen have complained that the courts, especially those in the District of Columbia, make too much law. But the inadequacy of the D.C. Code and infrequent efforts to patch it have given the courts here little choice.

The D.C. Crime Commission's message is clear. Congress can act quickly to have Washington's jumble of criminal laws examined by experts and, following their recommendations, write some law that the courts will not have to improve.